

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 22, 2008, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 10, 15, 16, 19 and 21. Claims 1-21 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Flannery (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,405). The Office Action rejected claims 8, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Flannery in view of Ebner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,452,094). The Office Action rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Flannery in view of Fong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,231).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

With regard to the anticipation rejection, Flannery is missing **newly** added features as specifically claimed. For example, Flannery merely discloses "...completion of preprinted forms with a word processor, or with another computer program suitable for generating text. More particularly, the present invention provides for the display of a scaled image of the form so that a user can accurately position text or other data for printing in the fields of the form." (see Summary of Flannery).

In contrast, all of the Applicant's independent claims now include automatically printing content onto the page with objects without printing information on the objects and without a user using a program to manually position the content to avoid the objects on the page. In addition, independent claims 1, 3, 16, 19 and 21 now include scanning a different page for acquiring content on the different page, independent claims 3 and 19 now include using optical character recognition software to convert a portion of the information on the different page into text, independent claims 10 and 21 now include reading a file containing content, independent claims 1 and 21 now include and claim 21 now includes a printer/scanner combination all-in-one device for detecting the size and location of objects printed on the page.

Also, independent claim 1 now includes using page decomposition software to locate at least one device on the page, independent claim 3 now includes using a

scanner to locate at least one object on the page and independent claim 10 now includes using a printer to locate at least one device on the page. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, and in particular, FIG. 2 and paragraphs [0012] - [0015] of the Applicant's published patent application, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0099656.

Clearly, since Flannery does **not** disclose all of the features of any of the independent claims, Flannery cannot anticipate the claims.

Next, with regard to the obviousness rejections, when Flannery is combined with either Ebner et al. or Fong et al., the combination of these cited references unquestionably does **not** disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features of the Applicant's newly claimed invention. For example, although Ebner et al. disclose letterhead merging with logos (see col. 6, lines 57 - col. 7, line 17 of Ebner et al.) and Fong et al. disclose using a keyboard or pre-stored data (see col. 3, lines 6-23 of Fong et al.), any combination of the cited references is still missing features of the newly claimed invention.

Namely, no combination of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest the Applicant's newly claimed automatically printing content onto the page with objects without printing information on the objects and without a user using a program to manually position the content to avoid the objects on the page and either scanning a different page for acquiring content on the different page, using optical character recognition software to convert a portion of the information on the different page into text, reading a file containing content, a printer/scanner combination all-in-one device for detecting the size and location of objects printed on the page, using page decomposition software to locate at least one device on the page, using a scanner to locate at least one object on the page or using a printer to locate at least one device on the page.

Therefore, because the Applicant's claimed elements are **not** disclosed, taught or suggested by the combined references, the combined references cannot render the claimed invention obvious, and thus, the Applicants submit that the rejection should be withdrawn. *MPEP 2143*.

Further, even though the combined references do not disclose, teach, or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention, the references should **not** be considered together because Flannery **teaches away** from the Applicant's claimed invention. For example, Flannery **explicitly** discloses that "preprinted forms" can be filled-in with a "...word processor, or with another computer program suitable for generating text. More particularly, the present invention provides for the display of a scaled image of the form so that a user can accurately position text or other data for printing in the fields of the form." However, the Applicant's claimed invention discloses that information is **automatically** printed onto the page with preprinted areas without printing information on the preprinted areas **and without a user using a program to manually position the content to avoid the preprinted areas on the page.**

If Flannery were modified without a user using a program to manually position the content to avoid the preprinted areas on the page, like in the Applicant's independent claims, the proposed modification would render Flannery being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and would change the principle of operation of the invention in Flannery being modified. This is because Flannery **explicitly requires** "...the display of a scaled image of the form..." in a program "...so that a user can accurately position text or other data for printing in the fields of the form..." when the user manually uses the program, in direct contrast and conflict with the independent claims of the present invention.


Since the Applicant's claimed elements are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the combined references and because Flannery teaches away from the Applicant's invention, Flannery cannot be used as a reference alone or in combination with other references, and hence, the Applicant submits that the rejections should be withdrawn. *MPEP 2143.*

Last, with regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03). Also, the other references cited by the Examiner also have been considered by the Applicant in requesting allowance of the dependant claims and none have been found to teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly requests the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (818) 885-1575. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: July 22, 2008

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edmond A. DeFrank', is written over a horizontal line.

Edmond A. DeFrank,
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX